New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements

Member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations.

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1921

Owned by New York Tribune Inc., a New York Corporation. Published daily. Ogden Reid, President; G. Verner Rogers, Vice-President; Helen Rogers Reid, Secretary; R. E. Maxfield, Treasurer. Address, Tribune Building, 154 Nassau Street, New York. Telephone, Beekman 3000.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—By mail, including Postage, IN THE UNITED STATES.

	One Year.	Six Months.	One Month.
By Mail, Postpaid.			
Daily and Sunday	$12.00	$6.00	$1.00
One week, 35c.			
Daily only	10.00	5.00	.85
One week, 30c.			
Sunday only	4.00	2.25	.40
Sunday only, Canada	5.00	2.25	.55
FOREIGN RATES			
Daily and Sunday	$26.00	$13.50	$2.40
Daily only	17.40	8.70	1.45
Sunday only	9.75	5.12	.80

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

GUARANTY

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape. No quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

The Associated Press is exclusively entitled to the use for republication of all news dispatches credited to it or not otherwise credited in this paper, and also the local news of spontaneous origin published herein.

All rights of republication of all other matter herein also are reserved.

A Vacation's End

After a vacation season, during which he had the advantage of the non-strenuous society of the palms, the President-elect is once again in contact with telegraph wires and hourly mails and can hear the hum of the politicians crowding hotel lobbies. The season for getting something good, or equally good, is open again.

The best wish that can be expressed for the President-elect is not that his absence has restored his physical vigor and bronzed his cheek but that it has stiffened into unchangeable form his resolution to do what he wants to do and what the people want him to do—namely, to disregard the pressure of those who seek to fill his ear with interested advice. As no Presidential candidate ever received so large a majority as Mr. Harding, so no President-elect has been as free as he is to consider only the public welfare. He is under obligation to nothing except to himself and to the oath of office he is soon to take.

Much of the report and gossip that has come from the neighborhood of the President-elect is disturbing. Few sincere friends of his will say that his Cabinet, if the list finally sent to the Senate is according to prevailing prognostication, will be satisfying to this country. Too many names of the conspicuously fit are absent for any one to say it is the best available. The guessers mention too many whose claims rest on personal friendship, too many who will derive luster from Cabinet office rather than add luster to the new Administration.

The country has expected a Cabinet of Lincoln size. It will be gravely disappointed if its expectation is not met. The folks do not wish to embarrass Mr. Harding by intruding their counsel, but they have a distinct idea of what they would like.

No Room for Competition

Some obstacles to complete cooperation in the development of the merchant marine were noted by Mr. William A. Harriman in his speech at the Republican Club. The first essential of our shipping policy is to create and maintain a big American merchant fleet. Congress had decided that government ownership was undesirable and that tonnage built during the war should be disposed of as soon as practicable to private owners. Government operation is to continue during the transition period. But the hope of any restoration of the American ocean carrying trade rests on a wide extension of private ownership and operation. This extension will be possible only with generous and long continued government support.

That has been the program of other maritime nations which have sucessfully built up their carrying trades. The last thing our government should want to do is to handicap private effort by government competition. The Shipping Board may feel anxious to keep its ships employed. But to employ them to the detriment of privately-owned ships, as Mr Harriman says is being done on the Hawaii-American route, would tend to defeat the primary aim of our shipping policy. The government cannot hope to make money on its present shipping investment. The only question is to liquidate it to the best advantage. To hold ships at tonnage prices which private owners cannot pay or to operate on lines where there is not enough business for both government-owned and privately-owned ships is to neglect team work and to lose sight of the main end in view.

The government fleet and the privately-owned fleet are not competitors and never should be. Each is an instrument to be employed for national purposes. And preference should naturally be given to the instrument which is to serve us in the future, after government ownership and operation cease.

Private owners who are putting capital into shipping to-day are putting it into a hazardous business. Private vessels will have to be subsidized for years to come—until they are sure of being able to hold their own with foreign competitors. They are intended to do a national work. They are therefore entitled to the most liberal consideration as agents in developing the foreign trade of which the United States now stands more than ever in need.

A Constructive Investigation

A criminal prosecution is necessarily destructive, and Mr. Whitman's able delving into the Police Department is no exception to the rule. He is indicting individuals who, if and when convicted, will be duly punished and removed from the scene. He has uncovered an area of grafting comparable with the most glorious days of the worst Tammanyized force.

From the extent and arrogance of this corruption it is plain that men higher up in the department must be either fools or knaves to have permitted such rottenness to come into existence. Difficult as the capture of the "higher up" guilty always is, there is every probability that Mr. Whitman's able, skillful hand will reach this far.

But even such indictments will not greatly advantage the City of New York unless the investigation is carried further. Mr. Whitman has not the authority or the duty to ascertain the broader basis of fact upon which a rehabilitation of the force can alone be founded. Crime is one thing, the corrupt political control of a municipal government, unfortunately, another—usually far more criminal and anti-social in its intent and operations, but almost impossible to punish as crime under the law. And the crux of the problem now facing the voters of New York, how to end the break-down of the police force resulting from the Hylan-Enright régime and prevent a recurrence of such a calamity, is not essentially a criminal problem but a political one. It involves the whole organization of the city administration, the charter, the local laws, the local processes of government.

Therefore, the uglier the criminal facts revealed by Mr. Whitman the more urgent the need of a thorough legislative investigation to delve more deeply and more widely in the realm of administrative and political misgovernment, with not the specific crime of individuals but the governmental salvation of a whole city as its goal. With the punishment of the guilty must come repair of the present and the construction of defenses against the future. Only the widest and ablest legislative investigation is equal to this task.

Mr. Wells's Strength and Weakness

One of the best criticisms of the Wells Outline of History that we have seen appears in The Nation from the pen of a fellow historian, Professor T. Salwyn Schapiro, of the College of the City of New York. There is a careful and illuminating review of the volumes in detail; and there is also, based upon this record, an extraordinarily fair and deep-probing analysis of the whole Wellsian mind and philosophy.

Professor Schapiro keeps his head and his adjectives in admirable control throughout. He gives large praise where it is due; he refuses to be stampeded either to irritation or extravagance by Mr. Wells's high points of nonsense or genius. Touching Mr. Wells upon Napoleon, for instance, he remarks that there is a laugh in every line but that "there is nothing worthy of serious notice." The whole violent belittling of Alexander, Cæsar and Napoleon Professor Schapiro characterizes justly as carried to absurd lengths. Conceding that historians have sinned grievously in exaggerating the majesty of our heroes, he concludes that the Wells "judgment of these worthies is even more fantastic and unreal than that of their glorifiers."

Excellent comment is also made upon the Wells treatment of nationalism as a reactionary force; to the contrary, it was "the revolutionary force of the nineteenth century and it is one of the great progressive forces of our day." It is not an idea that can be eliminated by merely taking thought. It is a "sentiment that expresses the desire of a community to live its own life in its own way, unhampered by restrictions imposed by autocrats or by outsiders." This is clear sense scientifically stated and it makes the Wells anti-nationalism sound like the romantic silliness that it is.

The summary of the Outline shows a magnificent design, a splendid imaginative conception, that makes the work an extraordinary and brilliant *tour de force*—the reading of it "a liberal education." But, Professor Schapiro regretfully considers, Mr. Wells is not an immortal and will not pass into future generations. He is "the most highly imaginative human being now living"; but his "intellect is not extraordinary." Therefore he is suggestive, not creative. He arouses, he stimulates; but he is utterly incapable of being the architect of any new system of thought in any field.

The Outline, like his more ambitious novels, begins superbly. The problem presented is a universal one, the characters approach it with magnificent strides. Then, when you are about half way through, there is a break, a sudden descent, and the book fizzles. The Outline begins with a magnificent conception of history as foretelling humanity's future. And what does that future turn out to be? "A vague, sentimental, middle-class, mid-Victorian vision of peace and prosperity."

There could not be a clearer statement of the Wells paradox that makes him easily the most interesting mind applying itself to the criticism of current life—and also one of the least reliable of guides upon the constructive side of the problem.

The Cost of Labor Slacking

In presenting their case for more control over labor conditions the railroad executives emphasize what has happened in the railroad repair shops.

In 1917 in the railway shops 302,828 machinists, blacksmiths, electricians, etc., were employed, who received $317,679,549 in wages. In 1920 the number employed was 443,774, and the wages paid were at the rate of $890,000,000 annually. The pay roll increased 40 per cent and the wages nearly 200 per cent. What of the work done? If the railroad executives speak truly the aggregate was but little larger in 1920 than in 1917.

The figures should be most interesting to organized labor. They throw into high relief the chief legitimate criticism of unions and suggest why the open shop movement has grown in strength. Employers would probably make little headway in bringing in the open shop if not assisted by a practice of unionists which is as much against the welfare of the unionists as against that of employers and the general public.

To the union idea itself objection is almost dead. Nor is the main opposition to the rate of wages. The principal complaint is to that deliberate decrease of production per employee which inevitably leads first to loss to the employer and then to greater loss to employees. If unionists but intelligently pursued their selfish interest labor disturbances would be few.

One pest of the industrial world is the superstition frozen in many union regulations that wages are paid out of profits, and hence that when the total of the extraction is enlarged it is necessarily good for wage workers. Only during temporary periods is this ever true. The wage fund is limited by production, and when production per man comes down, then down comes compensation.

The other pest, equally its brother in malignancy, is the stupid delusion, also inherited from the past, that labor gains when two rather than one are on a job. This has been a most powerful influence in depressing wages. Few labor leaders who give thought to their problems are victims of it, but they plead their inability to open the minds of their followers to a simple truth. However this may be, they seldom try, and so the business of manufacturing useless and non-productive work and multiplying jobs continues.

A time will doubtless come when organized labor, for the good of its membership, will have lecturers in labor political economy, but this time is distressingly slow in arriving. The absurdity that labor saving is bad for the laborer still holds its grip and is the provoking cause of destructive strikes and lock-outs.

Futile Short Sessions

The short session ends three weeks from next Friday, and Congress is now in the throes of the biennial legislative jam. Every two years the general futility of the December-to-March sitting is demonstrated afresh. But there isn't enough energy left in Washington after the crisis is over to break away the shackles of an outgrown political calendar.

The legislative work of a year can't be crowded into three scant months. It could be in the old days, when routine business was light and the appropriations were a twentieth, or even a tenth, of what they are now. We didn't have a billion-dollar Congress until 1890. Now we have three to four billion dollar sessions. Even appropriation bills are beginning to fail with some regularity at the short session. Some may fail again this year in spite of the acceleration brought about by the creation of a single House committee to handle many measures. As for other legislation, it is left more than ever at the mercy of minority opposition groups and even single objectors.

Most of the important bills which have passed one house or the other are held up in the present jam. They include the emergency immigration and tariff bills, the meat packers' bill, the soldiers' bonus bill and the reapportionment bill, the last named the best measure of the sort which the House has passed for many decades. There is serious opposition, open and covert, to many of these bills. But it is more desirable, whatever its merits may be, that Congress should act on a bill of consequence than that it should be choked to death blindly in a log jam. Congress is, in fact, introducing into its procedure something like the President's "pocket veto."

This legislative "pocket veto" also offers an easy escape from personal responsibility. It is common talk at the Capitol that many Representatives and Senators have supported bills at this session on the theory that the latter would never reach a final roll call. Short session conditions therefore encourage political juggling and window dressing, while at the same time they put enormous obstacles in the way of desirable measures which have a sincere majority's support behind them.

A session of adequate length each year, with no snap time limitation, is needed to insure straightforward and intelligent handling of the nation's business.

"Dudes and Nincompoops"

Senator Smith, of Arizona, protests against efforts "to raise the great American of the future under a glass globe," declaring that the only result would be "a generation of dudes and nincompoops." Perhaps Roosevelt's word "mollycoddles" would have been more happily descriptive. The dude is an almost forgotten type and the nincompoop is an extreme instance of degeneration in intellect. Yet many will sympathize with the Senator that to protect people from every sort of temptation is not to make them morally strong.

Welfare legislation is desirable up to a certain point. But the point is easily overstepped. There is such a thing as "the social conscience"—in other words, enlightened public opinion. But man is an individual no less than part of a social entity, and it cannot be good for the social conscience to have the individual conscience atrophied. "The strongest man is he who stands alone," is the conclusion Ibsen draws in "An Enemy of the People." The sheltering process has its dangers.

There is a public opinion which is beyond law and is more effective than law; and no law which has not the support of this opinion will long achieve its purpose. The trouble with most legislation dealing with manners or morals is that it too often emphasizes one view of controversial matters. Nor can men and women entirely surrounded by inhibitions be strong. They may not, it is true, be "dudes and nincompoops"; they may be worse.

Mr. Bryan is entitled to take note of the fact that the votes cast in the two houses to sustain the President's latest veto were 16 and 1.

The Call for General Wood

High Expectations of the People That Only Sinister Forces Can Defeat

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: There is some captious comment on the prospective Cabinet appointments of President-elect Harding, but there is one point that cannot be too strongly emphasized. The people of this country will not much longer tolerate the disregard of their wishes in nominations and appointments. Our government is supposed to be one of and for the people, but their choice of their choice the effect will be so disthe election of candidates selected by minorities, and the appointees are seldom called by the vox populi.

At the present crisis nothing could be clearer than the call for General Wood for a high and responsible position. That justice will be done in the case of this great man, so long shelved by the peevish autocracy of the outgoing rule, and that we can have the opportunity to apply his wisdom and experience to our pressing problems constitute a demand that no incoming Administration could safely ignore.

If the people are disappointed of their choice the effect will be so disheartening as to deaden the whole triumph of the election. Many hopes have been placed upon the entering Administration; to kill these hopes will be disastrous. We can only trust that Mr. Harding will not begin so inauspiciously. He cannot afford to do so, nor can we afford to lose our higher expectations. It is time that some assurance came. Only sinister forces can defeat this demand of the people. Will politicians never learn?

We want to remove the stigma from this word "politician." It ought to be synonymous with "statesman." Politics is not a game for the advancement of individuals, but a great science, and it should bear evidence of wisdom. Discerning minds should not find it necessary for the people to ask for General Wood; he should be taken for granted. The notion that he represents a spirit of militarism is too absurd to be believed by any but a few fanatics. We have had enough of deliberate misrepresentation. It is unthinkable that we should begin another course of it. The tension is becoming too great. Why can we not be reassured?

M. C. SMITH.

East Orange, N. J., Feb. 4, 1921.

Echoes of Mr. Daniels

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Why is it that so many of our naval officers back up Mr. Daniels at all costs? Even the General Board appears, in many respects, to simply echo his ideas! Is it not plain, after the awful record of the past eight years, that the opinions of Mr. Daniels are worse than valueless? Far better quote the Ahkoond of Swat!

OLD NAVY.

New York, Feb. 4, 1921.

Too Optimistic

(From The Philadelphia Inquirer)

Because, according to its figures, the consumption of whisky decreased from 89,641,985 gallons in 1917 to 5,581,553 gallons in 1920, with proportionate decreases in other liquors, the Anti-Saloon League calmly states that prohibition saved the country over a billion dollars last year. It refuses to take into account, of course, that the country paid from eight to ten times as much for its liquor as it did in 1917.

The Conning Tower

"The Pigeon-Scarer"

Every mornin' I useta watch and wonder,
While all them pigeons was flyin' around his head.
What was he doin' with that, now, fishin'-pole,
Funny and blacklike, and the sky all red.'

After a while I thought he must be crazy:
Didn't he know they don't catch birds that way?
But still he done it, and I finely goes
Inta the bird-store, and I asts 'em, "Say,

"That dizzy gink there, 'way up on the roof,
What is he doin'—what's he tryin' to prove?"
They says he was a reg'lar pigeon-scarer,
And has to keep them pigeons on the move.

A pigeon is a lazy thing, you see;
They like to set around and hate to fly;
But if you let 'em, then they clean forget
How flyin' is, and so get sick, and die.

Now, ain't that funny? But I got to thinkin'
How Life is like that; and, you know, it seems
Troubles and things like those is pigeon-scarers,
And pigeons is your soul, or elset your dreams.

If everything goes right, they get all lazy,
And fat, and crawl around all weak and slack;
So then old pigeon-scarer comes along,
And pokes 'em up. And all the stren'th comes back

Inta your dream-wings or your soul-wings—see?—
And—Whish!—they leave the lazy parts of you
Down on the ground, and up, 'way up, they go,
Up where it's clean, and beautiful, and blue.

But here's the sad part, when you come to think:
They sneak back to the place he chased 'em from;
Always they get back to the lazy ways—
Always the pigeon-scarer has to come.

JOHN V. A. WEAVER.

The Thanatopsis Club of Gopher Prairie telegraphs its indorsement of Mrs. W. G. Harding's musical taste. "Our favorite song, too," it wires, "is 'The End of a Perfect Day.'"

"I never thought of taking a cocktail before Prohibition," confided Dulcinea, "but now I take one whenever I am offered one. May never get another chance, you see."

The Search for Knowledge

Sir: "As inclusive as a newsstand that carries The Bookman" is good. Spent three hours last night trying to get a copy of the February issue and got no end of healthful exercise.

Reflected at last that maybe the stands in the big railway stations might be a chance. Hiked to Penn Station first, and there found a traveler arguing with the two uniformed counter attendants that the January National Geographic was out. Driven to the wall by ridicule, he finally confessed that he was a hick and had seen the magazine on a stand in Philadelphia. Both attendants then bawled him out in the way that only a real New Yorker can do to a provincial. Right on his heels I asked for The Bookman—though I might have known better.

But I had a lot of time and a little spirit left, so I fared on to Grand Central. There I found the arcade newsstand closed temporarily for repairs (and, I hope, extensions). One fighting chance remained—the counter in the main waiting room. Well, believe me or not, I discovered an attendant there who was kind to me and who sold me, proudly, the only extant copy of the current Bookman in Greater New York.

Out of this might we not evolve a sales system? Let the Grand Central lay in a supply of Bookmans for the territory of Manhattan east of Fifth Avenue. Let the Doubleday, Page bookshop in Penn Station be made venders by special appointment to the territory west of Fifth Avenue (inasmuch as it would be impossible to talk the Penn lobby newsstand into catering to the whims of highbrow hicks).

CUSH.

As a general rule writers and editors want to discuss anything but their work when they are on a holiday.—Ray Long in The Bookman.

As a general rule writers and editors don't want to discuss anything but their work when they are on a holiday; and more often than not themselves in relation to it.

"Have you Jessie Rittenhouse's lost anthology?" queried a hiker as he peered in the doorway.

"Yes, indeed, would you like it?" I said.—Mary Frank in The Bookman.

A more maliciously candid person than Miss Frank might have said "I hope so."

To all other reviews of Mr. Houdini's "Miracle Mongers and Their Methods" we prefer that of Mr. Percy Hammond, who says it is indubitably the most valuable treatise on the subject that has been issued by E. P. Dutton & Co. this season.

Although white paper still costs a lot of money, all cars, journalistically, are high powered. And an audience,—though three words take a lot of ink and paper,—always rises to its feet.

"As to burning Liberty bonds," writes Cas, "didn't you know that all the Liberty bonds in the country have been stolen long ago?" . . . By the way, how is the Nicky Arnstein case progressing?.

The Philistines Be Upon Thee, Ben Ami

Overheard at "Samson and Delilah."

"Well, that's the worst performance I ever saw—bar none!"

"If he'd only learn to talk English I could stand him better."

"Just cheap emotionalism. Anybody could do that. . . . I wonder what Alec saw in him—and he a sergeant in the U. S. army, too!"

A. F. Z.

There is a good deal in a name, but the Thrill Distributing Company has just been incorporated at Wilmington, Del., for the manufacture of non-alcoholic beverages.

There is, thinks G., adventure, too, in Mathematics, such as being vamped by a Sinuous Curve; and tragedy, such as marriage to a Variable who is the Limit.

Doubtless the Vicious Circle is also Eccentric.

F. P. A.

"SHOOT HIM IN THE PANTS, THE COAT IS OURS"

Copyright, 1921, New York Tribune Inc.

Forget and Forgive

A Few Typical Replies to the Assertion of a Reader That a German Indemnity Is Unchristian

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The assertion of your correspondent Russell J. Clinchy to the effect that the action of the Allied powers in demanding of Germany the sum of fifty-two billions of dollars is a direct challenge against the principle of Christianity is, I contend, a serious misapprehension of the truth. It is much of a kind with the principle underlying the idea of pacifism.

As the Christ of the New Testament is merciful and demands that His followers be likewise, so also the God of the Old Testament was merciful, but not without a condition in either case. Both demand that the transgressor be penitent, and humbled, "accepting of his punishment," and willing to make restitution up to the "extent of all the substance of his house." (Lev. xxiv, 18-21. Prov. vi, 30-31.)

And John, the forerunner of Christ, demands of the Pharisees and Sadducees that they "bring forth fruits meet for repentance." So also Christ Himself in His parable describes the impenitent debtor as being "delivered to the tormentor," and of his having "to pay up to the uttermost farthing." (Matt. v, 26, and xviii, 34.) So, then, where do we get the idea of the unconditional forgiveness demanded by Mr. Russell Clinchy?

That very much mistaken idea that Jesus Christ was the impersonation of an unreasoning mollycoddle principle needs repudiating most vehemently, as it is a propagator of much infidelity, bringing unmerited scorn and derision upon the Church of Christ.

MAURICE C. ROBERTS.

New York, Feb. 4, 1921.

Not Revenge but Justice

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The letter in yesterday's Tribune entitled "Forget and Forgive" is an instance of the common mistake of taking up a single verse in the Bible, dwelling wholly on that and forgetting to compare it with other portions of the same Scripture, which either explain it or state other phases of the truth.

The demand to forgive our enemies applies to personal conduct. Savages took the law into their own hands. The Old Testament describes how courts of justice were formed among the Hebrews to prevent men from doing this and enable them to submit their disputes to an impartial court. Christ found the people of His time especially needed warning against revenge and malice, but equally He sent His apostles to teach the position of the civil magistrates and their duty to punish those that do evil. As a recent version expresses it, "they are God's servants to inflict his punishment upon those who do wrong." St. Peter declares that "the governors are sent by the emperor to punish evildoers and commend those who do right." When, therefore, an organized army of robbers burst into Belgium and northern France, killed the people, ravished the women, destroyed the churches and universities and robbed and took what they could get, it was not only the right but the duty of civilized nations to punish them and "to execute justice."

We find in our own time the influence of Christ's teachings in both aspects. The practice of dueling, which was a sort of private war by which men undertook to punish individual wrongs, has practically been abolished. A gentleman is not "sudden and quick in quarrel," as his ancestors were. But, on the other hand, the Allies united to punish the great crime that the Germans had committed. The indemnity that they are now demanding is not a matter of revenge but of justice. It is impossible for the Germans to restore to life those they have killed or to replace the beautiful buildings they have destroyed, but it is at least possible for them to make compensation for the material injury they have done. It is their duty to do this, and the nations are doing simple justice in requiring it.

EVERETT P. WHEELER.

New York, Feb. 5, 1921.

Christianity Will Not Die

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: That the shallow, servile whimperings of the German people are still able to win over weak-hearted sympathizers is demonstrated by the views of Russell J. Clinchy, printed in The Tribune of this date.

The essence of Mr. Clinchy's letter betrays his sad lack of knowledge of the reasons for placing the indemnity, and I wonder where he has been during the last seven years. While the unwarranted invasion of Belgium, the slaughter of its inhabitants, the wholesale destruction of French property, the sinking of passenger ships, etc., all may be overlooked in the light of some Biblical phrases, still the Allied peoples take the virile, sinful stand that Germany must pay for the damage it wrought during its spasm of fallacy. As a result the succeeding generation of Germans may be forced to shoulder part of the burden imposed by the Allied countries, and the more prompt they are in their payments the quicker will they be able to whitewash the besmirched reputations of their indiscreet fathers.

In any case, Christianity will not die, despite Mr. Clinchy's lugubrious prediction.

RANDOLPH ST. JOHN.

New York, Feb. 4, 1921.

Maudlin Christianity

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The letter "Forget and Forgive" is the best exhibition yet of the maudlin state of mind in which some alleged Christians are placed by the alleged teachings of their Master. I shall endeavor to answer it.

Since when is the collecting of an indemnity for damages done called vengeance? If it is so, our courts of justice, who daily allot damages for injuries suffered or losses incurred by the plaintiffs, cannot be called Christian; no more so can the American soldiers who went "over there" to help put down the fiendish followers of the Kaiser, for did they not help punish the invaders of Belgium and visit vengeance upon the Germans?

If the payment of this indemnity places "a nation of men, women and their children in economic slavery," what about France, the wronged and despoiled nation, who will find herself in economic slavery, with her children, if this indemnity is not paid? How about Belgium, the martyr, who would find herself in the same predicament? Is it more Christian to deprive the injured of their just dues than to force the recalcitrant malefactor to make reparation?

It is high time that a certain kind of unhealthy religious buncombe and weak sentimentality which parades under the name of Christianity should get its just deserts from the press and the pulpit, or the very name of Christianity will suffer from the vaporings of its deluded defenders.

JUSTICE.

Pelham, N. Y., Feb. 5, 1921.

John Spargo Explains

The "Cock and Bull Story" About "Secret Conclave"

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I beg the courtesy of your columns for a personal statement. With reference to the protest against anti-Jewish propaganda in this country, recently published, for which I was solely responsible, the Jew-baiting organ of Henry Ford, The Dearborn Independent, publishes a fantastic "explanation." According to this story, there was a secret consultation of leading Jews in New York, which I attended and at which I was with great difficulty persuaded to undertake the Jewish defense, after I had told the Jewish leaders a lot of unpleasant truths. It is suggested that if I could only be induced to say publicly what I told this secret gathering of Jewish leaders there would be a sensation.

The protest against anti-Semitism was initiated by me without consultation with anybody, either Jew or Christian. It was privately printed, at my own expense, and submitted to many influential non-Jews before any person of Jewish birth or belief knew of its existence. After it was printed and was in private circulation, and had been signed by many representative men and women, I mentioned the matter to a few friends gathered in one of the downtown clubs.

The circumstances were as follows: A group of gentlemen, Christians and Jews, were lunching together and discussing the alleged predominance of Jews among the Russian Bolsheviki. Because of my interest in the subject, I was invited to join the party. A previous engagement making it impossible for me to be at the luncheon, I arranged to join the group after luncheon for as much of the conversation as the time at my disposal permitted. Those present were Melville E. Stone, of The Associated Press; Oscar S. Straus, Rabbi Wise, Jerome Landfield, of the American-Russian Chamber of Commerce; Louis Marshall and myself—three Jews and three Gentiles. All of the gentlemen named, with the exception of Mr. Marshall, were old personal friends.

In the course of a general discussion, and in response to a question, I gave the result of my investigation into the subject of the alleged Jewish predominance among the leaders of Bolshevism. Incidentally I remarked that in my judgment the Jews need not bother to defend themselves against the vicious and silly charges being spread broadcast by The Dearborn Independent and other anti-Semitic agencies; that they could very well leave the matter to be dealt with by their non-Jewish fellow citizens, whose sense of decency and fair play would, I felt certain, inspire them to vigorous protest against a movement which is an affront to American ideals and to Christian civilization. I do not know whether this is the "secret consultation" of Jewish leaders referred to or not. I do know that it is the only gathering of any kind which I have attended at which the subject has been even broached.

It would not be worth while paying any attention whatever to this stupid cock and bull story, and I should not think of honoring it with such attention were it not for the fact that if the story of a secret gathering of Jewish leaders is not contradicted it may take its place with the legend of the other secret conclave of Jewish leaders associated with the protocols.

JOHN SPARGO.

Boston, Mass., Feb. 5, 1921.